UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,910	11/30/2001	Joan C. Teng	21756-011900	4169

51206   7590   02/14/2007
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER
BLÁIR, DOUGLAS B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/998,910	TENG, JOAN C.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Douglas B. Blair	2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 December 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-46</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-46</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/28/2006</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/23/2006 has been entered.

2.   Claims 1-46 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent

Number 6,968,503 to Chang et al. in view of 6,986,138 to Sakaguchi et al.

3.   As to claim 1, Chang teaches an identity system, a method for defining workflow for

managing entity identities, the method comprising the steps of: the identity system accessing a

template that indicates parameters for defining workflows (col. 21-29 show xml templates for

identities); creating a definition of a first workflow for managing at least one identity of at least

one entity based on said template (col. 21-29, each patient identity is managed using the xml

templates); and storing said definition of said first workflow (col. 21-29); however, Chang does not explicitly teach the workflow system controlling access management functionality.

Sakaguchi teaches an access management system comprising an identity system for managing identity profiles, and an access system for providing security of resources across one or more servers (Figure 12b) including an access management system accessing a template that includes parameters for defining workflows (col. 7, lines 31-48, col. 12, lines 61-67 and Figure 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Chang regarding a workflow system with the teachings of Sakaguchi regarding managing access in a workflow system because different users may require different levels of access to a workflow (Sakaguchi, col. 7, lines 31-48).

4.   As to claim 2, Chang teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein: said template includes a set of parameters for each action available to a workflow type (col. 21-29, each template has parameters which define actions).

5.   As to claim 3, Chang teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein the template is an XML document (col. 21-29).

6.   As to claim 4, Sakaguchi teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising adding data to said template after said step of storing; creating a definition of a second workflow after said step of adding data; and storing said definition of said second workflow (Figure 2).

7.   As to claim 5, Chang teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of creating said template (col. 7, lines 31-48, col. 12, lines 61-67 and Figure 2).

8.   As to claim 6, Sakaguchi teaches the method of claim 5, wherein said step of creating

said template includes the steps of: adding a set of workflow types to said template; adding one

or more actions for at least a subset of said workflow types; and adding parameters for at least a

subset of said actions (col. 7, lines 31-48, col. 12, lines 61-67 and Figure 2).

9.   As to claim 7, Chang teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said template

applies to only one application (cols. 21-29).

10.   As to claim 8, Chang teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein: said template

includes parameters for creating objects, deleting objects and changing attributes (cols. 21-29).

11.   As to claim 9, Chang teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein: said template

includes parameters for self registration (cols. 21-29).

12.   As to claim 10, Chang teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein: said template

includes a parameter indicating whether supplied variables can be used in said step of creating

(cols. 21-29).

13.   As to claim 11, Sakaguchi teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein: said template

includes a parameter indicating whether additional workflows can be used to supply data (col. 7,

lines 31-48, col. 12, lines 61-67 and Figure 2).

14.   As to claim 12, Sakaguchi teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein: said

additional workflows includes multiple levels of nesting of workflows (col. 7, lines 31-48, col.

12, lines 61-67 and Figure 2).

15.   As to claim 13, Sakaguchi teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein: the identity

system is integrated with an access system (col. 7, lines 31-48, col. 12, lines 61-67 and Figure 2).

16.   As to claim 14, Chang teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said step of

creating includes the step of: accessing one or more parameters in said template, offering a set of

options based on said accessed parameters (cols. 21-29); and receiving a selection of one or more

of said offered options (cols. 21-29).

17.   As to claims 15-19, they are rejected for reasons pointed out below with regard to claim

20.

18.   As to claim 20, Chang teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said step of

creating includes the steps of: determining a first set of possible actions for a particular step

based on said template (cols. 21-29); reporting said first set of possible actions; receiving a

selection of a first action of said first set of possible actions (cols. 21-29); determining a first set

of possible data types for said first action based on said template (cols. 21-29); reporting said

first set of possible data types; receiving an indication of a variable for said first workflow (cols.

21-29); receiving a selection of a first data type for said variable (cols. 21-29); determining

whether pre or post actions are available for said first action based on said template (cols. 21-29);

reporting whether pre or post actions are available for said first action (cols. 21-29); receiving a

selection of whether to add pre or post actions to said definition of said first workflow for said

first action (cols. 21-29); determining a first set of possible entry conditions for said first action

based on said template (cols. 21-29); reporting said a first set of possible entry conditions (cols.

21-29); receiving a selection of a first entry condition of said a first set of possible entry

conditions (cols. 21-29); determining and reporting whether said first entry condition is

associated with a sub-workflow (cols. 21-29); and receiving an indication whether said first

workflow should wait for said sub-workflow (cols. 21-29).

19.   As to claim 21, Chang teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said step of

creating includes the steps of: accessing one or more parameters in said template (cols. 21-29);

offering a set of options in a graphical user interface based on said accessed parameters (cols. 21-

29); and receiving a selection of one or more of said offered options using said graphical user

interface (Fig. 4).

20.   As to claims 22-32, they feature limitations found in claims 1-21 and are rejected for the

same reasoning presented above.

21.   As to claims 33-39, they feature limitations found in claims 1-21 and are rejected for the

same reasoning presented above.

22.   As to claim 40, Chang teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein the workflow

performs a task selected from the group consisting of: creating a user, deleting a user,

subscribing a user to a group, enrolling a certificate, renewing a certificate, revoking a certificate,

and changing a user attribute (col. 18, lines 50-67).

23.   As to claim 41, Chang teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein the at least one

entity is selected from among the group consisting of at least one user, at least one group and at

least one organization (cols. 21-29).

24.   As to claim 42, Chang teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising: a

workflow engine invoking the workflow (Fig. 2).

25.   As to claim 43, Chang teaches a method according to claim 42, wherein the workflow

comprises a set of actions comprising one or more actions, the method further comprising: a

client program performing one of the one or more actions (Fig. 2).

26.   As to claim 44, Chang teaches a method according to claim 43, the method further

comprising: the workflow engine passing to the client program a callback handle uniform request

locator ("callback URL"); the workflow engine pausing the workflow; upon completion of the

one or more actions, the client program invoking the callback URL; and upon an invocation of

the callback URL, the workflow engine restarting the workflow (col. 10, lines 15-64).

27.   As to claim 45, Chang teaches a method according to claim 43, wherein performing the

one of the one or more actions comprises: the client program composing an extended markup

language ("CXML") document comprising a request for the one of the one or more actions (cols.

21-29); the client program transmitting the XML document for reception by an application (cols.

21-29); the application performing the one of the one or more actions (cols. 21-29); the

application transmitting a second XML document for reception by the client program, the second

XML document comprising an output message (cols. 21-29).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

28.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

29.   Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent

Number 6,968,503 to Chang et al. in view of 6,986,138 to Sakaguchi et al. in further view of

U.S. Patent Number 6,457,066 to Mein et al..

30.   As to claim 46, the Chang-Sakaguchi combination teaches the method of claim 45;

however, the Chang-Sakaguchi combination does not explicitly teach the use of SOAP.

Mein teaches the use of SOAP in the context of a workflow (col. 4, line 61-col. 5, line

50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the

time of the invention to combine the teachings of the Chang-Sakaguchi combination regarding

the implementation of workflows using XML templates with the teachings of Mein regarding the

use of SOAP because SOAP enables better interaction with clients over the internet (Mein, col.

3, lines 3-27).

Response to Arguments

31.   Applicant's arguments filed 12/27/2006 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive. The applicant argues that: (a) XSL templates as taught by Chang are not workflow

definition templates, however, and as such, are of no relevance of claim 1; (b) Saguchi does not

teach management to any web server, but rather teaches access management to workflows

themselves; (c) There is no motivation or suggestion to combine Sakaguchi with Chang because

Chang already has access management functionality but the applicant's note that change does not

have security for web servers; and (d) Chang does not teach various dependent claims.

32.   Before addressing the specific arguments presented by the applicant the Examiner would

like to make it clear that the claims are given the broadest reasonable interpretation. The

Examiner can find no limiting definitions of workflows and templates in the applicant's

specification. As pointed out in the office action mailed on April 25th, 2006, merely alleging that

the office action does not further prosecution does nothing to further prosecution. It seems, based on the applicant's arguments, that the applicant has definitions for the terms workflow and template in mind but the applicant never bother to point out how these terms are defined. Thus the office is forced to interpret the claims as a generic XML based system for handling data processing.

33.   As to point (a), the Examiner believes that the workflow definition templates taught by Chang do read on claim 1. Should the applicant continue to argue that they are different, the applicant is urged to explain why rather than just continue to state that they are different in order to further prosecution.

34.   As to point (b), claim 1 requires an access system for providing security of resources across one or more web servers and claim 1 states absolutely nothing about the management of access to web servers. If the applicant would like the claimed invention to be directed towards the management of access to web server such a relationship should be explicitly claimed.

35.   As to point (c), the motivation is explicitly provided in the rejection. Chang teaching an access management system means has nothing to do with the ability to combine Chang with Sakaguchi. Both Chang and Sakaguchi relate to systems for data management via xml templates thus their various methods are combinable. It is also unclear why the applicant states that Chang's access management system does not teach security for any web server even though the applicant's claims have nothing to do with security for web servers.

36.   As to point (d), these arguments are based on the applicant's interpretation of the claims. The applicant has made it clear that the applicant's interpretation is different then the examiner's interpretation but the applicant has not enlightened the Examiner as to how the claims should be

interpreted. The applicant is arguing what the claims aren't rather than explaining what the claims are. Such arguments do not further prosecution and only perpetuate a deadlock.

Conclusion

37.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

38.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas B. Blair whose telephone number is (571) 272-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Douglas Blair

ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER